

MATHEMATICS

ENTIRE FUNCTIONS SATISFYING A LINEAR
DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION

BY

G. H. FRICKE AND S. M. SHAH

(Communicated by Prof. N. G. DE BRUIJN at the meeting of April 27, 1974)

ABSTRACT

If f is an entire function and satisfies a certain differential equation, then it is shown that f is of bounded index. This extends a theorem of S. M. Shah.

1. INTRODUCTION

An entire function f is said to be of bounded index if there exists a nonnegative integer N such that

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \left\{ \frac{|f^{(j)}(z)|}{j!} \right\} > \frac{|f^{(n)}(z)|}{n!} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and all } n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

The least such integer N is called the index of f .

Let $f(z)$ be an entire function satisfying a linear differential equation of the form $\sum_{j=0}^n P_j(z)f^{(n-j)}(z) = Q(z)$, where P_j and Q are polynomials and $\deg P_0 \geq \deg P_j$. Then $f(z)$ is of bounded index [4]. In this paper we show that this theorem holds when $Q(z)$ is replaced by an entire function $g(z)$ of bounded index. We prove

THEOREM 1. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function and suppose that $f(z)$ satisfies the differential equation*

$$(1) \quad P_0(z)f^{(n)}(z) + P_1(z)f^{(n-1)}(z) + \dots + P_n(z)f(z) = g(z),$$

where $P_j(z)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ are polynomials and $P_0(z)$ is of degree not less than that of any $P_j(z)$, and $g(z)$ is an entire function of bounded index. Then f is of bounded index.

An entire function F is said to be of bounded value distribution in the sense of TURAN [3, problem 2.28] if there exists an integer p such that the equation $F(z) = w$ has at most p roots in any disc of radius 1.

HAYMAN [3] and FRICKE [1] showed that an entire function F is of bounded value distribution if and only if F' is of bounded index. Thus we have the following consequence.

COROLLARY 2. *If $F(z)$ is an entire function such that $F'(z) = f(z)$ satisfies the differential equation (1) then $F(z)$ is of bounded value distribution.*

2. PROOF

For the proof of Theorem 1 we need the following result due to HAYMAN [3].

THEOREM A. *An entire function f is of bounded index if and only if there exist an integer $N \geq 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|f^{(N+1)}(z)| < C \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \{|f^{(j)}(z)|\} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. If $g(z)$ is of bounded index then by Theorem A there exist $N \geq 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$|g^{(N+1)}(z)| < C \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \{|g^{(j)}(z)|\} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |g^{(N+1)}(z)| &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{d^{N+1}}{dz^{N+1}} P_j(z) f^{(n-j)}(z) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{N+1} \binom{N+1}{k} P_j^{(k)}(z) f^{(n-j+N+1-k)}(z) \right| \\ &< C \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \{|g^{(j)}(z)|\} \\ &= C \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{t=0}^j \binom{j}{t} P_k^{(t)}(z) f^{(n-k+j-t)}(z) \right| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_0(z) f^{(n+N+1)}(z)| &< \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{N+1} \binom{N+1}{k} P_j^{(k)}(z) f^{(n-j+N+1-k)}(z) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \binom{N+1}{k} P_0^{(k)}(z) f^{(n+N+1-k)}(z) \right| \\ &\quad + C \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{t=0}^j \binom{j}{t} P_k^{(t)}(z) f^{(n-k+j-t)}(z) \right| \right\} \\ &< (C+1)(n+1)(N+2)(N+1)! \max_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq n \\ 0 \leq k \leq N+1}} \{|P_j^{(k)}(z)|\} \times \\ &\quad \max_{0 \leq j \leq N+n} \{|f^{(j)}(z)|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\deg P_0 > \deg P_j$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$, there exist $M > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} M|P_0(z)| &> |P_j^{(k)}(z)| \text{ for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, n \text{ and } k = 0, 1, \dots, N+1 \\ &\text{and for all } |z| > R. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$|f^{(n+N+1)}(z)| < (C+1)(n+1)(N+2)(N+1)! M \max_{0 \leq j \leq N+n} \{|f^{(j)}(z)|\} \text{ for } |z| > R.$$

Hence, for $S = (C+1)(n+1)(N+2)(N+1)!$ M and $T = n+N$,

$$|f^{(T+1)}(z)| \leq S \max_{0 \leq i \leq T} \{|f^{(i)}(z)|\} \text{ for } |z| > R.$$

This inequality holds for $|z| < R$ [4; p. 133] if we replace S by a suitable constant. Therefore, by Theorem A, f is of bounded index. q.e.d.

REMARK: Theorem 1 can also be proven using similar methods as in [4]. The authors also want to thank J. P. Beauchamp for his helpful suggestion in the proof of Theorem 1.

*Department of Mathematics,
Wright State University,
Dayton, Ohio 45431, U.S.A.*

*Department of Mathematics,
University of Kentucky,
Lexington, Kentucky 40506, U.S.A.*

REFERENCES

1. FRICKE, G. H., A note on multivalence of functions of bounded index, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **40**, 140-142 (1973).
2. HAYMAN, W. K., Research problems in function theory, (Athlone press of the University of London 1967).
3. ———, Differential inequalities and local valency, Pacific J. of Math. **44**, 114-137 (1973).
4. SHAH, S. M., Entire functions satisfying a linear differential equation, J. of Math. and Mech. **18**, 131-136 (1968).